

State of Utah DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

or

Michael O. Leavitt
Governor
Robert L. Morgan
Executive Director
Lowell P. Braxton
Division Director

1594 West North Temple, Suite 1210 PO Box 145801 Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-5801 (801) 538-5340 telephone (801) 359-3940 fax (801) 538-7223 TTY www.nr.utah.gov

December 6, 2002

CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT 7099 3400 0016 8895 6382

Gary Gray, Resident Agent West Ridge Resources, Inc. P.O. Box 902 Price, Utah 84501

RE: <u>Proposed Assessment for State Violation No. N02-49-2-1, West Ridge Resources, Inc., West Ridge Mine, C/007/041, Compliance File</u>

Dear Mr. Glasson:

The undersigned has been appointed by the Division of Oil, Gas & Mining as the Assessment Officer for assessing penalties under R645-401.

Enclosed is the proposed civil penalty assessment for the above referenced violation. The violation was issued by Division Inspector, Karl Houskeeper, on November 19, 2002. Rule R645-401-600 et. seq. has been utilized to formulate the proposed penalty. By these rules, any written information which was submitted by you or your agent within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this Notice of Violation has been considered in determining the facts surrounding the violation and the amount of penalty.

Under R645-401-700, there are two informal appeal options available to you:

- 1. If you wish to informally appeal the <u>fact of this violation</u>, you should file a written request for an Informal Conference within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter. This conference will be conducted by the Division Director. This Informal Conference is distinct from the Assessment Conference regarding the proposed penalty.
- 2. If you wish to review the proposed penalty assessment, you should file a written request for an Assessment Conference within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter. If you are also requesting a review of the fact of violation, as noted in paragraph 1, the Assessment Conference will be scheduled immediately following that review.



NOV #02-49-2-1 C/007/041 December 6, 2002 Page 2

If a timely request for review is not made, the fact of violation will stand, the proposed penalty(ies) will become final, and the penalty(ies) will be due and payable within thirty (30) days of the proposed assessment. Please remit payment to the Division, mail c/o Vickie Southwick.

Sincerely,

Pamela Grubaugh-Littig
Assessment Officer

sd
Enclosure
cc: OSM Compliance Report
Vickie Southwick, DOGM

O:\007041.WR\COMPLIANCE\ASSESSMENT\N02-49-2-1LTR.DOC

U.S. Postal Service CERTIFIED MAIL RECEIPT (Domestic Mail Only; No Insurance Coverage Provided) ш 12/6/02, C/007/041-N02-49-2. 8895 Postage Certified Fee Postmark 9700 Return Receipt Fee (Endorsement Required) Here Ristricted Delivery Fee (Endorsement Required) 00hE total Postage & Fees | \$ Recipient's Name (Please Print Clearly) (to be completed by mailer) GARY GRAY
Street, Apt. No.; or PO Box No. P O BOX 902 City, State, ZIP+4 PRICE UT 84501

WORKSHEET FOR ASSESSMENT OF PENALTIES DIVISION OF OIL, GAS & MINING

| COM | /IPANY/ | MINE | West Ridge Resou | rces, Inc. | PERMIT <u>C/007/041</u> | | | |
|-----|---|---|--|---|---|-------------------------|-----|--|
| NOV | / / CO # | N | 02-49-2-1 | | VIOLATIO | ON <u>1</u> of <u>1</u> | | |
| | | | TE <u>December 4</u> | | | | | |
| ASS | ESSME | VI OFI | FICER Pamela Gru | ioaugn-Liuig | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | |
| I. | HISTORY (Max. 25 pts.) | | | | | | | |
| | A. | | nere previous violation of today's date? | ons, which are | not pending or | vacated, which fall one | (1) | |
| | PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS | | | EFFECTI | VE DATE | POINTS | | |
| | N02-49-1-1 | | | 2002 | 1 | | | |
| | | | 1 point for each pa 5 points for each p No pending notice | ast violation in | n a CO, up to or | e(1) year | 1 | |
| II. | TOTAL HISTORY POINTS 1 SERIOUSNESS (Either A or B) | | | | | | | |
| | NOTE: | | For assignment of points in Parts II and III, the following apply: | | | | | |
| | | 1. | | s supplied by the inspector, the Assessment Officer will hin each category where the violation falls. | | | | |
| | | 2. | | p or down, util | l-point of the category, the Assessment Officer will or down, utilizing the inspector's and operator's g documents. | | | |
| | Is this an EVENT (A) or HINDRA | | | | (B) violation? | Hindrance (B) | | |
| | A. | A. <u>EVENT VIOLATION</u> (Max 45 pts.) | | | | | | |
| | | 1. | What is the event | which the viol | ated standard w | as designed to prevent? | , | |

2. What is the probability of the occurrence of the event which a violated standard was designed to prevent?

| PROBABILITY | <u>RANGE</u> | |
|--------------------|--------------|--|
| None | 0 | |
| Unlikely | 1-9 | |
| Likely | 10-19 | |
| Occurred | 20 | |

ASSIGN PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE POINTS _____

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

3. What is the extent of actual or potential damage?

RANGE 0-25

In assigning points, consider the duration and extent of said damage or impact, in terms of area and impact on the public or environment.

ASSIGN DAMAGE POINTS ____

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

- B. <u>HINDRANCE VIOLATION</u> (Max 25 pts.)
 - 1. Is this a POTENTIAL or ACTUAL hindrance to enforcement? **Potential** RANGE 0-25

Assign points based on the extent to which enforcement is actually or potentially hindered by the violation.

ASSIGN HINDRANCE POINTS ___5

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

The permittee is diverting underground mine water through disturbed culverts and diversions where it is being stored in the sediment pond. The disturbed culverts, diversions, and the sediment pond are not designed for conveyance and/or storage of mine water. The underground mine water has a permitted UPDES discharge point (002). This outfall places the mine water into the undisturbed bypass culvert. The UPDES permit also lists (001) sediment pond discharge point. The disturbed area culverts, ditches, and sediment pond are not designed or approved for conveyance and/or storage of mine water in the approved MRP.

TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS (A or B) 5

III. <u>NEGLIGENCE</u> (Max 30 pts.)

A. Was this an inadvertent violation which was unavoidable by the exercise of reasonable care? IF SO--NO NEGLIGENCE; or, was this a failure of a permittee to prevent the occurrence of a violation due to indifference lack of diligence, or lack of reasonable care, or the failure to abate any violation due to the same? IF SO--GREATER DEGREE OF FAULT THAN NEGLIGENCE.

No Negligence 0
Negligence 1-15
Greater Degree of Fault 16-30

STATE DEGREE OF NEGLIGENCE: Negligence

ASSIGN NEGLIGENCE POINTS 8

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

The disturbed culverts, diversions, and sediment pond are not designed or approved for conveyance and/or storage of mine water. The underground mine water has a permitted discharge point (002). This outfall is approved by the UPDES permit and is discussed in the approved MRP.

IV. GOOD FAITH (Max 20 pts.)

(Either A or B)

(Does not apply to violations requiring no abatement measures)

A. Did the operator have onsite, the resources necessary to achieve compliance of the violated standard within the permit area?

IF SO--EASY ABATEMENT

Easy Abatement Situation

• Immediate Compliance

-11 to -20*

(Immediately following the issuance of the NOV)

Rapid Compliance

-1 to -10

(Permittee used diligence to abate the violation)

• Normal Compliance

0

(Operator complied within the abatement period required) (Operator complied with condition and/or terms of approved Mining and Reclamation Plan)

^{*}Assign in upper of lower half of range depending on abatement occurring the 1st or 2nd half of abatement period.

B. Did the permittee not have the resources at hand to achieve compliance, or does the situation require the submission of plans prior to physical activity to achieve compliance?

IF SO--DIFFICULT ABATEMENT

Difficult Abatement Situation

• Rapid Compliance

-11 to -20*

(Permittee used diligence to abate the violation)

Normal Compliance

-1 to -10*

(Operator complied within the abatement period required)

Extended Compliance

0

(Permittee took minimal actions for abatement to stay within the limits of the NOV or the violated standard of the plan submitted for abatement was incomplete)
(Permittee complied with conditions and/or terms of

approved Mining and Reclamation Plan)

EASY OR DIFFICULT ABATEMENT?

ASSIGN GOOD FAITH POINTS 0

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

Good faith will be addressed upon completion of following the UPDES and approved MRP, which have not been met to date. The water should be directed as authorized by the UPDES permit and the approved MRP. Submission of plans is an option that the operator can utilize if compliance with UPDES discharge limits is an issue at outfall (002).

V. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

NOTICE OF VIOLATION # N02-49-2-1

- I. TOTAL HISTORY POINTS ___1
- II. TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS <u>5</u>
- III. TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS <u>8</u>
- IV. TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS $\underline{}$

TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS 14

TOTAL ASSESSED FINE \$140.00

O:\007041.WR\COMPLIANCE\ASSESSMENT\N02-49-2-1ASSESSMENT.DOC